

REMARKS

New claims 10 - 14 are added. Support is found in applicants' specification page 15, line 9 - page 16, line 4. No new matter is entered.

Applicants respectfully acknowledge Examiner's withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1 - 9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stowell (US2002/0099579) in view of Najmi (U.S. Patent 6,687,848) for the identical reasons as stated in the previous Office Action dated 08/08/2005. Applicants maintain their disagreement with this rejection.

Specifically, Applicants' first step of claim 1 of defining an engagement model which will be used to address a marketplace requirement is not found in Stowell. The Examiner cites paragraphs 77, 19, and 20 of Stowell. Paragraph 77 has no mention of an engagement model. Paragraph 19 - again cited on page 4, 13th line down from top, of Examiner's Remarks in the present office action - states that "the system of the present invention provides modules". However, these modules have nothing to do with Applicants' requirements for defining an engagement model, despite the similar sounding word. Paragraph 20 describes "the ability for the participants to select pre-set business rules and customize business rules that are applicable to a particular arrangement between partners." This does not describe Applicants' claim 1 because Applicants' claim 1 engagement model is required to be used to create an industry-wide engagement

END920010071US1

-6-

09/882,148

template applicable to all businesses in said marketplace.

Furthermore, as pointed out in Applicants' response to the previous Office Action, Paragraph 19 of Stowell does describe "templates for contracts, RFP's, RFQ's, and other terms and conditions." However, Applicants' template of claim 1 must be created using the engagement model just described and must be applicable to all businesses in said marketplace. Stowell's templates are pre-defined, not created using an engagement model.

Applicants maintain that Stowell therefore does not describe the first two steps of claim 1 for the reasons just described. Nor does Najmi describe these two steps. Claim 1 is allowable. Likewise, independent claim 8 is allowable because it recites the same two steps. All of the remaining claims, including new claims 10 - 13, are dependent directly or indirectly on allowable claims 1 or 8 and are therefore also allowable. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

New claims 10 - 13 recite additional features of applicants' invention which are also not found in Stowell or Najmi. Claims 10 - 13 are therefore also allowable for this reason. Allowance is urged.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in

END920010071US1

-7-

09/882,148

order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 03/28/06

By: John Pivnichny
John R. Pivnichny
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358
Fax: (607)429-4119

09/882,148

-8-

END920010071US1